

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of August 9, 2007, the Examiner (1) rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,041,399 ("Terada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,659,722 ("Blaner"); (2) rejected claim 10 as allegedly obvious over Terada in view of Blaner, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,504,903 ("Chen et al."); (3) rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 21 as allegedly obvious over Terada, in view of U.S. 6,931,632 ("Ramasamy et al."), in view of Blaner; (4) rejected claims 11, 13, 15, 18, and 22 as allegedly obvious over Terada in view of Patent No. 6,088,786 ("Feierbach et al."), in view of Blaner; (5) rejected claims 19-20 as allegedly obvious over Terada, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,931,632 ("Ramasamy et al."), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,525 ("Hammond et al."), in view of Blaner. In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 5, 9, 11, and 19. Based on the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Claim Amendments

Applicants' contribution generally involves a single instruction that performs two different comparison-related functions based on a particular bit in the instruction. The Examiner alleges that Terada discloses an instruction that performs one of the claimed functions and that Blaner discloses a separate instruction that performs the other of the claimed functions. See Final Office Action page 23. Each of the two separate prior art instructions has a different opcode. The Examiner further stated that he considers one of the bits in the opcodes to be the claimed "bit" that species which of the two functions is performed by the instruction.

The Examiner's contention has been addressed by way of amendment. The independent claims have been amended to require that the "bit" is separate from the opcode that defines the instruction. These amendments are fully supported by the specification at least at paras. [0026] through [0031] and Figure 5 (Rd[3] bit being separate from opcode field 230), as would be recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. None of the art of record teaches or even suggests such a bit or a single instruction

that performs the two claimed functions based on such a bit. For at least this reason, all claims are allowable over the cited art.

The Examiner's reliance on *In re Larson* is misplaced

The Examiner relied on *In re Larson*, 144 U.S.P.Q. 374 (C.C.P.A. 1965) for the proposition that "making two instructions with Blaner and Terada into a single instruction would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art." Final Office Action pages 22-23 (according to the Examiner based on *Larson*, "to make integral doesn't give patentability over the prior art," Final Office Action page 23). Applicants respectfully submit that *Larson* does not support the Examiner's argument.

In *Larson*, a claim required a brake drum "integral with" a clamping means. *Id.* at 347. The prior art Tuttle reference disclosed a brake disc "rigidly secured to" the clamping means. *Id.* at 349. The CCPA held that "the brake disc and clamp of Tuttle et al. comprise several part...rigidly secured together as a single unit. The constituent parts are so combined as to constitute a unitary whole." *Id.* at 349. Thus, *Larson* does not stand for the proposition, as alleged by the Examiner, that it is not patentable to make integral what were two separate pieces. Instead, *Larson* stands for the proposition that two prior art pieces rigidly secured together are "integral," as was required in the claim at issue.

In Applicants' case, the prior art discloses two separate instructions. Such instructions are not integrated together or otherwise part of one common instruction, as is required by all of the pending claims. Whereas the prior art in *Larson* taught two pieces rigidly secured together, the cited prior art in the present case teaches two separate instructions. Such a prior art teaching of two separate instructions does not render obvious, in light of *Larson*, a single, multi-function instruction. For this additional reason, the claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicants hereby petition for any time extensions that are necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned. In the event that additional

Appl. No. 10/632,214
Preliminary Amdt. Dated October 26, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

fees related to this Amendment, or other transactions in this case, are required (including fees for net addition of claims and for time extension), the Examiner is authorized to charge Texas Instruments Inc.'s Deposit Account No. 20-0668 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/
Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS